

## UTAH STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

W. R. CALDERWOOD, M. D., Salt Lake.....President  
E. H. SMITH, M. D., Ogden.....President-Elect  
FRANK B. STEELE, M. D., Salt Lake.....Secretary  
J. U. GIESY, M. D., Salt Lake.....Associate Editor for Utah

### SEEMING DISCRIMINATION

Attention of all reserve officers is hereby called to Bulletin 210-31 A. G. under date of September 14, 1926. Briefly, this is a ruling by the comptroller applying to the status of enlisted men in the United States Army who may have been granted commissions in the reserve. Briefly, it states that such a man may not be ordered to active service at a training camp and receive pay during such service in his commission grade. We understand fully the policy of not paying a man twice. We understand the possible intent of not paying an enlisted man as such, and as an officer during the same period, but—

Under the National Defense Act of 1920 the intent of the War Department has been to build up the reserve as a very important element in the defense scheme of this country. This ruling now removes from the enlisted man who has accepted a commission under this act the very incentive which may have caused him to take such action, and it furthermore prevents the intent of the granting of such commissions from reacting in the intended way. Because under army regulations such a man to gain promotion or advancement must have attended at least one training camp of at least fifteen days, and the ruling practically puts up a bar against his taking such necessary steps in quite automatic fashion. It is a fact that other men in government employ are permitted to attend schools on pay and are still paid for the service to which they belong at the time such attendance is given. Then why discriminate? Why should the man in uniform be barred from the privilege given other employees of the nation both serve? We wish all reserve officers would think this over and seek to devise some means by which action looking to a reconsideration of this recent ruling—which is no less than a direct blow at, to say the least, the morale of a part of the reserve itself—may be obtained. This could be well done perhaps in the form of resolutions asking for some such action, passed by reserve organizations, civil organizations of which reserve officers are members, and personal letters to appropriate legislators. We feel that such action might well constitute a patriotic service. Under the comptroller's ruling the War Department is practically helpless. Action must come from outside sources if at all. But we trust that it may come none the less, since come it certainly should.

### AN INVITATION

The idea of a Utah section of CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN MEDICINE is to give representation to every part of the state in medical matters and consequently keep the entire body of the profession in touch with the activities of the several societies and their work.

Therefore, now that the component county socie-

ties have once more resumed meetings, we as the editor of the Utah section are again appealing to the secretaries and officers of these various societies or to any member of any society to send in to the office of the Editor, Felt Building, Salt Lake City, any news of value to medical readers before the 12th of each month. We are hoping that some will respond in the spirit in which this request is made. We cannot print the news unless we have it. We've done the best we could by clippings and reports gained in roundabout ways. But our task would be simplified immensely, and the results would be far better if a brief resumé could be forwarded to us for our use. Won't the various societies please co-operate?

### GUERRILLA WARFARE

About the only consistent thing about mankind is its consistent inconsistency. If you'll think that dictum over you'll agree with it perforce. And the worst of it is that it applies no less to the doctors than it does to the man in the street. We may rave about the dumb foolishness of our patients, but they have little on us when it comes to the way we conduct ourselves. And one of the worst bits of inconsistency, one of the most hurtful examples of this tendency, is manifested in the instances of gratuitous criticism of one another in which a few of our profession indulge.

We hold that to be able to criticize *anything*, the one who undertakes the critical task must know something about the subject under discussion. To put it baldly, he must know what he is talking about. This would presuppose that he be grounded in the elements of the situation, have a complete knowledge of the circumstances, incidents and details which resulted in bringing about the condition concerning which he gratuitously appoints himself a judge. How can he intelligently or justly evaluate the situation without? Yet how often do we meet instances of a physician seeking to criticize the work of another member of the same profession without any such fundamental groundwork of knowledge.

It appears to us more and more that such men are either deliberately indifferent to the principle of fairness, actuated by some petty feeling of personal spite, moved by an egotism sufficient to blind them to true proportions as affecting others, or else just simply hopelessly ignorant. In explanation of the last statement let us point out that the ignorant man is generally the surest in his assumption of knowledge, and the better-informed individual is one who hesitates longest in the assumption of infallibility as a characteristic of his own.

And yet criticism, unless well deserved, unless based upon the very best of knowledge, and then called for by circumstances making it practically obligatory, is one of the most foolish performances from a professional standpoint in which the doctor can indulge. Because criticism hurts the man criticized in a measure, hurts the man who criticises, in the esteem of his fellows, and possibly otherwise, and hurts the standing of the entire profession with the public rather more than any other one thing. For in the mind of the laity, if the profession doesn't know its stuff, then wherein is the profession any better than the cults? And any man who is guilty

of throwing doubt against the very art which he professes to practice is certainly guilty of a very foolish action, if nothing worse. Heaven knows, with the best we are able to do through the most sincere endeavor, we in our own hearts may yet find enough over which to criticize ourselves. So why in the name of common everyday intelligence should we seek to broadcast the possible shortcomings of our craft for the petty and puerile pap of a few minutes of self-shining in the eyes of some totally uninformed person with the light of an assumed brilliance which we seek to seem to possess? For even here there is a danger that, unless we are deadly sure of our ground, future events will prove that our brilliance was rather the *ignis fatuus*—fox fire of rotten misinformation, than something grounded on a full and true knowledge of the facts. And when that happens our little temporary illumination is very apt to go out.

And so as we have preached before, we are preaching again: Let's play the game as gentlemen. Let's develop an *esprit d'corps*—a sort of stick togetherness. Let's do the best we can with a full realization that we may make errors and mistakes, despite our sincerest efforts to avoid them, and that the other fellow may perchance do the same thing and eat his heart out in secret over them. Let's be broadminded enough to credit him with sincerity of endeavor the same as ourselves, rather than damn him for his errors, while speaking only of the successes which have crowned our own efforts. Let's have *sense* enough to know that every criticism of the work of another member of our profession, voiced in the ears of one who knows nothing of our work, its obstacles, difficulties and heartbreaking failures, and who judges us solely upon the basis of our end results, is a direct blow aimed at the very thing upon which the success and advancement of medicine as an art depends—at the average man's confidence—the trust, the faith he feels in the doctor. Criticism is of two sorts—constructive and destructive. Constructive criticism may build up, but gratuitous, undeserved or improperly grounded criticism *destroys*. The practice of medicine should be a "gentleman's game." Let's play it as such. Don't let's engage in this guerilla warfare of criticism behind the other fellow's back. That is the coward's trick.

**Utah News**—September 20 saw the resumption of meetings by the Holy Cross Clinical Association for the winter months. The meeting was held in the auditorium of the Holy Cross Hospital with a good attendance, President Peterson presiding. Barnard and Pugh presented a case of endocarditis; Bailey, an interesting problem in diagnosis between actinomycosis and tularemia; and Minear, a case of perinephritic abscess. Meetings begin promptly at 8 o'clock and end about 9:30. Members are invited to present interesting cases and to invite friends.

During the past month F. M. McHugh and Mrs. McHugh returned from Europe, where the doctor has been pursuing a course of special work in his specialty during the past four months. Most of their time was spent in Vienna.

E. G. Hughes and family have gone to Long Beach, California. Doctor Hughes will study in the coast universities while away.

The Editor left October 4 for a trip in the East. While absent he will visit New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago. At the latter city he will attend the convention of the American College of Physical Therapy.

Utah still leads the United States in the per capita en-

rollment of medical men in the Officers' Reserve Corps, U. S. A. Now that October is upon us and the correspondence courses are once more being started, we would like to appeal to every reserve officer to sign up for one of these courses. The reserve can only be as good as the men composing it, and the man can only be as good as his knowledge permits. Fall in! Sign up! For information write Headquarters 104th Division, Vermont Building, Salt Lake.

**Salt Lake County Medical Society** (M. M. Critchlow, secretary)—A regular meeting of the Society was held at the Commercial Club, Salt Lake City, September 27, 1926, President F. H. Raley presiding. Fifty-six members and four visitors were present.

Minutes of the previous meeting were read and accepted without correction.

F. F. Hatch presented a patient on whom he had operated for diverticulum of the bladder which had been present since infancy. The operation included transplantation of the ureter which ran into the diverticulum, and excellent result was obtained.

J. F. Sharp talked on "Extra Uterine Pregnancy." He described the etiology, pathology, symptoms, diagnosis before and after rupture, the differential diagnosis and the treatment. He illustrated his points with many examples from his own practice and gave a very interesting discussion of the résumé, which was discussed by H. S. Scott, Ray Woolsey, L. C. Stevenson, A. Lipkis, A. A. Kerr, and John Z. Brown.

C. J. Pearsall talked about eczema. He gave an excellent discussion of the various types and presented the diagnostic points between eczema and dermatitis venata, seborrheic dermatitis, infectious dermatitis, scabies, lichen planus, ringworm, syphilis, mycosis fungoides, periporosis, and psoriasis. Discussion by William L. Rich.

Applications of C. W. Countryman and E. P. Oldham were voted upon and both were elected to membership, twenty-six votes being cast.

**Meeting of October 11, 1926**—Held at the L. D. S. Salt Lake City, President Raley presiding. Fifty members and five visitors present.

Minutes of the previous meeting were read and accepted without correction.

The scientific program was arranged by the hospital staff. The cases were well worked up and very interesting. The following clinical cases were presented and discussed:

"Shotgun Wound of the Foot," John Z. Brown; "Possible Chronic Tularemia," H. T. Anderson; "Possible Substernal Goiter," Henry Raile; "Stone in the Bladder in a Patient with Congenital Heart Disease," F. A. Goeltz, G. G. Richards, and Doctor Leigh; "Possible Addison's Disease," Clark Young; "Probable Tuberculous Epididymitis," O. J. LaBarge.

Communication from H. T. Fischer regarding the tour of Dr. Franz Nagelschmidt of Berlin was read.

## NEVADA STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

W. L. SAMUELS, M. D., Reno.....President  
HORACE J. BROWN, M. D., Reno.....Secretary and Associate Editor for Nevada

**Officers elected at the Twenty-third Annual Session of the State Medical Association were as follows:**

President, W. L. Samuels, Reno; first vice-president, R. R. Craig, Tonopah; second vice-president, William H. Riley, Gold Hill; secretary-treasurer, Horace J. Brown, Reno. Trustee for two years, D. A. Turner, Reno. Trustee for one year, S. K. Morrison, Reno. Delegate to A. M. A., Horace J. Brown, Reno. Alternate, C. E. Piersall, Reno.

The minutes have not been received in time for publication in this issue, but will appear in the December number. Part at least of the papers presented at the meeting will be published during the coming months.